

**Wednesday, June 2, 2010**

**To all whom it may concern,**

**We, Wenceslao Gonzalez Jr. and Cibeles J. Gonzalez are in opposition to having any evaluations done on us during the duration of this trial for the following reasons:**

**1) Our bitter experiences, both here and in Spain, born out of multiple civil rights violations has only served to make us highly skeptical of the supposed legality attributed to questionable proceedings such as the one being discussed in this letter. Only someone who has gone through what we have had to bear for nearly two years, without the benefit of authentic due process, while having found ourselves numerous times the victims of gross deceit, can fully understand the appropriateness of our well founded doubts, especially when confronted by requests whose potential to promote justice are in themselves highly dubious at best, and on further analysis can be said to be unconstitutional.**

**2) Even if the abuses to our rights, that we have had the misfortune to be subject to, would not be considered as a valid basis for refusal of these “evaluations”, the false labels which have been heaped on our sons as a result of DCYF ordered evaluations should serve to us as a warning on how impartial these evaluations really are, and thus inevitably lead us to question if DCYF’s special interests or agenda are considered a priority by those who do the evaluating.**

**To take lamentable yet normal reactions of a toddler, that are to be expected when a child of such a tender age has been exposed to traumatic situations, and then use them as a basis for falsely labeling that child for life, are ( we believe) grounds for doubting not only the truthfulness of these proceedings, but for protesting the lack of humanity that is so evidently manifested when someone in the name of special interests disdains the empathy towards the suffering of others that is so crucial for the fervent upholding of justice.**

**A traumatized child has suffered enough already without having to endure in future years the stigma that can accompany false labeling.**

**3) Even if the evaluator would have an earnest disposition to be impartial, the very process by which these evaluations are done ( a reality which we stated when the first request was made in the September 2009 hearing) makes impartiality nearly impossible. The social worker of DCYF is the one who speaks first to the evaluator and provides them with their “information” and views before he or she meets us. By this act on the part of DCYF the evaluation is no longer impartial, because a preconceived notion has already been formed of us, and as such it is inevitable that it will influence to a certain degree the perceptions of the evaluator which will serve as the sole basis of any evaluation results.**

**4) We feel that it is both outrageous and a mockery to due process when one’s opponent in court (who obviously does not share one’s interests for the sheer fact that they are one’s opponent) is allowed the privilege of initiating a process upon which so much could depend, and which if handled in a partial manner could result in disastrous consequences for us that can seriously jeopardize our ability to obtain justice.**

**5) We feel that it is unwise to submit to evaluations that are ordered and influenced by our opponent in court when we have not yet been able to establish our case or present any evidence. If we are to judge the reliability of these evaluations according to the erroneous results of previous evaluations, which have also been ordered by DCYF on our sons, there is then great cause for concern that the purpose of these evaluations may be to damage our credibility and thus render ineffective any defense that we can give on behalf of our sons.**

**6) It has been made known to us that DCYF has stated that our religious beliefs and the fact that we state the truth about what our eldest son once knew makes us delusional. This has led us to contemplate the possibility of this evaluation delving into areas or possibly twisting things which are not relevant to this case in a desperate attempt to latch unto something.**

The First Amendment in the Constitution guarantees freedom of religious belief for all citizens, a fundamental Constitutional right which we believe should be vigorously guarded as long as one's religion does not lead one to commit crimes or to hurt others. Since religion is solely based on individual or group perceptions it should not be twisted in an attempt to use it as an indicator of supposed incompetency, especially when the religion in question believes in the promotion of ethics and in teaching children a moral code which will further enable them to be productive people in the real sense. If religious beliefs are to be put on trial, then it is only a matter of time before an atheist evaluator states that the person whom he evaluated is delusional for praying. Since religious beliefs and perceptions differ, to allow an evaluator to pass sentence on another's beliefs is basically to give supreme importance to the evaluator's religious perceptions (or perhaps lack of) at the expense of the evaluatee's religious liberty which is guaranteed by the Constitution. The statement that we are delusional for stating the truth about our eldest son's accomplishments prior to this traumatic situation, which has dragged on for nearly two years, is merely a form of psychological blackmail meant to intimidate us into not defending our sons for fear of what can be said about us. The fact that DCYF can resort to such tactics makes us all the more wary of subjecting ourselves to any procedures that they initiate and as such may have an ability to influence.

7) The evaluations are done in such a fashion that we cannot be present at each other's evaluations, which means that each of us will lack a reliable witness about what we said during our evaluation.

8) Since both here and in Spain there has been an obvious attempt to twist everything that we say or do in order to make it conform to the image of us that is most beneficial to the interests of those who had played a part in this injustice, we are naturally concerned about anything that we say in an evaluation being taken out of context, or being twisted somehow in order to confer on it a different meaning according to the perceptions that the evaluator chooses to use in his or her method of interpreting it. If such a thing were to occur (and it has before, in meetings with social workers both here and in Spain) we would lack the reliable witnesses (as explained in

reason 7) necessary to refute any false statements.

9) We have done independent research on the Internet and have seen how DCYF has in other cases used these evaluations for character assassination purposes in order to build up their case against parents, so the fact that they are insisting for these evaluations precisely during the period in which they are presenting their case and before we have gotten to present ours only reaffirms in our view what we have read.

10) We feel that the fact that we are being pressured to submit ourselves to these highly questionable evaluations, yet no one has so much as thought that it is necessary for our accusers (who at present have custody of our children) to likewise be submitted to them is ample proof of the partiality that has been a hallmark of this unjust case. Our accusers have fabricated many things about us out of a well known hatred towards our marriage. Yet no one in their blindness feels that someone who is capable of doing so many harmful things in an irrational quest to wreck a marriage, and who in the fervent pursuit of such a worthless endeavor refuses to live their life in peace and allow others to do likewise needs an evaluation. This view is all the more incomprehensible when one considers that this person has present custody of our children. Logic dictates that foster parents should be more subject to rigorous supervision and to evaluations than biological parents. This is due to the undeniable that almost all parents will naturally care for their own children with more zeal and with infinitely less self-interest than a foster parent. This situation is further complicated, and the child's true well being placed at risk when the foster parent has shown no love towards the child prior to obtaining custody, and yet is supported by biased leniency at not being subject to cautionary procedures that are more appropriate towards them than towards the biological parents. We are carefully supervised on our visits with our children, yet no one supervises or carefully observes how our children's half-sibling interacts with them on a day to day basis. Such double standards which reek of partiality, coupled with DCYF's close contact and support of our accusers can only serve to sever any potential hope that we may have had with regard to obtaining some fairness from their decisions.

**This of course affects our belief in the reliability of any procedure which DCYF initiates, as justice can never be expected from a partial environment without defying rationality.**

**11) We feel that both the plaintiffs and defendants in any court case should be awarded equal privileges and opportunities for their defense without taking into account position, status, or the level of influence normally exerted by the person.**

**It is a grave blow to our rights to bestow special privileges on DCYF in this case just because as an agency they have more influence and monetary resources than we do. Justice should never be tied to abundant privileges, it should rather be an conscientious effort to make privileges equal, in an effort to understand what the actual reality is, which will always exist apart from the conveniences of societal advantages.**

**The fact is that all the requests that we have made to DCYF have been denied (with the exception of vaccine exemption), from making sure that our children are kept on an organic kosher diet to us being allowed to have study sessions with them. Yet they, while ignoring our requests which are reasonable assertions of our long trampled on parental rights, have the power to pressure us into procedures which in all likelihood are designed to further restrain our ability to exercise our rights, which the judicial system supposedly exists to preserve and uphold.**

**12) The last but not least reason for our refusal to submit to these evaluations is the fact that our ability to survive this situation and remain together despite having gone through experiences like being homeless proves our stability and fortitude. No unstable couple would have survived our ordeal and remained united as a couple, especially when one takes into account the identity of our accusers and their true motives in starting all this.**

We hope that our reasons are respected and viewed as a written defense of our Constitutional rights as well as the result of careful consideration in our ever more difficult quest to achieve an atmosphere of impartiality with the hope of avoiding further violations of our civil liberties, while defending our children's genuine interests. Our children were taken away from us without any due process, so we ask, that after nearly two years of grief, that our rights be given respect that is proportionate to the magnitude of the wrong that we have suffered.

We thank all who are willing to promote greater impartiality in the earnest pursuit of justice.

Sincerely,